

REMARKS

At the outset, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the claim amendments made herein do not adequately resolve the issues identified by the Examiner in the pending Office Action.

Summary of the Office Action

Claim 21 stands objected to because of the informalities.

Claims 1-5, 8, 9 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Ha et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0058389) in view of Maeda et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/041470887).

Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Ha et al. as modified by Maeda et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and in view of Kubota et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0171792).

Claims 11-15 and 17-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Ha et al. as modified by Maeda et al. and Kuboda et al., as applied to claim 10 above.

Summary of the Amendment

Independent claims 1, 10, 12, 19, and 21 have been amended. No new matter has been introduced. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Objection to Claim

Claim 21 stands objected to because of the informalities. To overcome the Office's objection to the claim, Applicants have amended claim 21 to correct minor informalities, namely "substantially" has been added. No new matter has been introduced. Thus, the Office's objection to the claim 21 is moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to claim 21 be withdrawn.

All Claims Recite Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-5, 8, 9 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Ha et al. in view of Maeda et al. Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C.

§ 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Ha et al. as modified by Maeda et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and in view of Kubota et al. Claims 11-15 and 17-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Ha et al. as modified by Maeda et al. and Kubota et al., as applied to claim 10 above. These rejections are respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claim 1 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 1 recites, for example, a combination of elements, “a substrate having a switching portion, a reflective portion and a transmissive portion, a pixel region being defined to include the reflective and transmissive portions, wherein the switching portion, a reflective portion and a transmissive portion do not overlap each other,...wherein the thin film transistor is disposed within the switching portion... wherein the plurality of uneven patterns are disposed within the reflective portion.” Claim 10 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 10 recites, for example, a combination of elements, “first and second substrates facing into and spaced apart from each other, the first and second substrates having a switching portion, a reflective portion and a transmissive portion, a pixel region being defined to include the reflective and transmissive portions, wherein the switching portion, a reflective portion and a transmissive portion do not overlap each other...wherein the thin film transistor is disposed within the switching portion...wherein the plurality of uneven patterns are disposed within the reflective portion.” Claim 12 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 12 recites, for example, a combination of elements, “forming a gate line on a substrate having a switching portion, a reflective portion and a transmissive portion, a pixel region being defined to include the reflective and transmissive portions, wherein the switching portion, a reflective portion and a transmissive portion do not overlap each other...wherein the thin film transistor is disposed within the switching portion...wherein the plurality of uneven patterns are disposed within the reflective portion.” Claim 19 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 19 recites, for example, a combination of elements, “forming a gate line on a first substrate having a switching portion, a reflective portion and a transmissive portion, a pixel region being defined to include the reflective and transmissive portions, wherein the switching portion, a reflective portion and a

transmissive portion do not overlap each other...wherein the thin film transistor is disposed within the switching portion...wherein the plurality of uneven patterns are disposed within the reflective portion.” Claim 21 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 21 recites, for example, a combination of elements, “forming a gate line on a first substrate having a switching portion, a reflective portion and a transmissive portion, a pixel region being defined to include the reflective and transmissive portions, wherein the switching portion, a reflective portion and a transmissive portion do not overlap each other...wherein the thin film transistor is disposed within the switching portion... wherein the plurality of uneven patterns are disposed within the reflective portion.”

On 4 page of the Office Action, the Examiner states Maeda et al. teach an analogous transfective LCD wherein the insulating layer under the reflective layer 31 and the pixel electrode 81 has a plurality of uneven patterns consisting of a first organic material layer 51 within the reflective portion. The plurality of uneven patterns of Maeda et al. is disposed within the reflective portion. However, the reflective layer 31 and the thin film transistor 14 of Maeda et al. overlap each other (see Fig. 9 and 10K of Maeda et al.). Accordingly, Ha et al. and Maeda et al. fail to teach or suggest at least these limitations of the claimed invention. For at least the above reason, Applicants respectfully submit that newly amended independent claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-5 and 8-9; newly amended independent claim 10 and its dependent claim 11; claim 12 and its dependent claims 13-15 and 17-18; newly amended independent claim 19 and its dependent claim 20; and newly amended independent claim 21 are allowable over the cited references of record.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of the Response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

EXCEPT for issue fees payable under 37 C.F.R. § 1.18, the Commissioner is hereby authorized by this paper to charge any additional fees during the entire pendency of this application including fees due under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17 which may be required, including any required extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0310. This paragraph is intended to be a **CONSTRUCTIVE PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME** in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(3).

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By: /David E. Connor/
David E. Connor
Reg. No. 59,868

Dated: July 22, 2011

CUSTOMER NO. 009629
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C. 20004
Tel.: (202) 739-3000
Fax: (202) 739-3001